UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,211	09/10/2003	Liane Redford	16222U-012710US	6545
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND CREW LLP TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER, 8TH FLOOR			EXAMINER	
			ALVAREZ, RAQUEL	
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3688	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/25/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/660,211	REDFORD ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Raquel Alvarez	3688				
	NG DATE of this communication app	'					
WHICHEVER IS I - Extensions of time ma after SIX (6) MONTHS - If NO period for reply i - Failure to reply within Any reply received by	STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAY be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 from the mailing date of this communication. In specified above, the maximum statutory period with the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, the Office later than three months after the mailing justment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fron cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
·	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
<i>'</i> —	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claim	·	p Qy,					
4a) Of the a 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1 7) ☐ Claim(s)	22 and 44-46 is/are pending in the above claim(s) is/are withdrav is/are allowed. 22 and 44-46 is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers							
10) The drawing Applicant ma Replacemen	ation is objected to by the Examiner (s) filed on is/are: a) access y not request that any objection to the control t drawing sheet(s) including the correction declaration is objected to by the Ex-	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S	S.C. § 119						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ 1. ☐ Certif 2. ☐ Certif 3. ☐ Copie applie	ment is made of a claim for foreign Some * c) None of: Tied copies of the priority documents Tied copies of the priority documents Ties of the certified copies of the prior Cation from the International Bureau The detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applica ity documents have been receiv I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage				
	on's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ire Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date				

Application/Control Number: 10/660,211 Page 2

Art Unit: 3688

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to communication filed on 12/8/2008.

2. Claims 44-46 have been added. Claims 1, 8 and 15, 21-22 have been amended. Claims 1-22 and 44-46 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-22 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell (5,956,694 hereinafter Powell) in view of Leonard et al. (5,903,874 hereinafter Leonard).

With respect to claims 1, 5-7, 15-16, 20-22 Powell teaches a system for managing a coupon redemption under a reward program (Abstract). A portable token configured to store an electronic coupon and a redemption information (i.e. customer carries customer card 295, the card containing coupon and redemption information about the products that can be redeemed (Figure 12);

A token acceptance device configured to receive the portable token and store a redemption limit relating to the electronic coupon, the redemption limit representing the maximum number of times the electronic is allowed to be redeemed for the corresponding reward under the reward program, the token acceptance device further configured to receive information relating to a transaction from a holder (i.e. checkout

900 901 and 902 having software to determine and make sure that the coupons are redeemed only once)(See Figure 15);

Wherein the holder indicates to the token acceptance device that the electronic coupon is to be redeemed and applied to the transaction (see Figure 15);

Wherein upon receiving indication of redemption of the electronic coupon, the token acceptance device compares the redemption limit to the redemption tally and determines whether the electronic coupon is allowed to be redeemed and applied to the transaction (i.e. the checkout determines if the coupon hasn't been redeemed, if it hasn't then it is applied to the transaction price)(see Figure 15).

Powell doesn't specifically storing in the coupon the redemption tally for the times that the coupon has been redeemed and updating the redemption tally. Leonard teaches on Figure 12, using a tally to determine if the coupon has reached its maximum number of usages in order to determine if it can be applied to the transaction and updating the file every time the coupon has been redeemed. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the of Powell's invention to have included in the memory storage of Powell's smartcard coupon, a tally for the times that the coupon has been redeemed and updating the redemption tally every time the coupon has been redeemed as taught by the file of Leonard because such a modification would allow the portable token (smart card of Powell) to internally keep track in each smartcard of the time the coupon has been redeemed and therefore will provide versatility and portability.

Page 4

Art Unit: 3688

With respect to claim 2, 8-9, 12-14, 44 and 46 Powell teaches a reward program sponsor establishing coupon conditions and redemption conditions and limits (i.e. store 100 setting coupon conditions and limits). Powell doesn't specifically teach the program sponsor communicating the redemption information to a reward host.

Leonard teaches on Figure 1, 132 overseeing and storing redemption limits, the redemption limits representing the maximum number of times an electronic coupon is allowed to be redeemed for a reward under the reward program (Figure 1, 132). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of Applicant's invention to have included a reward host in order to allow the reward host to share the information as to the terms and redemption information pertaining to the reward programs and the like.

Claims 3, 10, 17-18 and 19 Powell doesn't teach the reward host is further configured to allow the reward program sponsor to change the redemption information in response to one or more conditions. Leonard further teaches Data Distribution System (DDS) 132 overseeing all the promotions coupons and discounts. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have included the store 1000 in Powell to use a reward host as disclosed by Leonard to oversee the entire reward schemes and to allow for stores 1000 to make changes and modifications. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to have included the teachings of Leonard of a host configured to allow the reward program sponsor to change the redemption information

Art Unit: 3688

in response to one or more conditions. Leonard further teaches Data Distribution System (DDS) 132 overseeing all the promotions coupons and discounts in order to obtain the above mentioned advantage.

With respect to claims 4, 11 Powell teaches the coupon based on holder's criteria such as demographic information. Powell that the demographic information is used to impose a redemption limit to the holder of the token. Leonard teaches limiting the redemption limit (Figures 10-12). It would have been obvious to use the customer's criteria of Powell to impose redemption limit in order to customize the coupon's limit based on the user's needs.

Claim 45 further recites resolving conflicts between the electronic coupon and a paper-based coupon. Official Notice is taken that it is old and well known to resolve conflicts such as conflicts between coupons presented to be redeemed. For example, if a customer presents two coupons with the same serial number or SKU or UPC the system will determine if that particular serial number or SKU or UPC pertaining to that particular coupon has been previously redeem. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the same principle of checking the serial number, SKU and UPC data on paper coupons and an electronic coupons and electronic coupon in order to avoid fraud.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Point of contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raquel Alvarez whose telephone number is (571)272-6715. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James w. Myhre can be reached on (571)272-6722. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Raquel Alvarez/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3688 Raquel Alvarez Primary Examiner Art Unit 3688

R.A. 2/22/2009